

## Route 28 Station – South Study Meeting Notes

Working Group Meeting #24

L.L. Coates ES library @ 7 PM, Wednesday 04-16-13

### **Administrative Items:**

- Chairman Jeff Fairfield opens the meeting with Work Group (WG) approval of the 02-20-13 meeting's summary.
- Jeff then moves to approve the previous meeting's summary (04-03-13).
  - WG member Mike Romeo makes two corrections to the "Discussion" section of the summary. Comments on the "Land Unit A-1 Intensity" were his. Comments on "Tiers 1,2 and 3 and Support Retail" should have included his thought on retail to include anchors.
  - With these corrections, this meeting summary is approved.
- WG member John Ulfelder asks staff if the WG is on track to be finished with its work by the end of the school year.
  - Clara Johnson, Depart of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), replies that we plan to have the WG's efforts concluded sometime in June.
- Jeff sets the next WG meeting date (after April 30<sup>th</sup>) for May 14<sup>th</sup>, a Tuesday.

**Transportation Analysis:** Mike Garcia, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT), shares the results of the transportation analysis of the land use scenario "G" which included a higher proportion of residential to commercial uses. See the following link for the presentation:

[http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/fcdot\\_28\\_wg\\_ppt\\_04\\_16\\_13.pdf](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/fcdot_28_wg_ppt_04_16_13.pdf)

### **Discussion:**

- **Transit Mode Share in the TOD** (slide 16): John asks why such a small percentage, between 6% and 12%, of trips are by transit according to this transportation model run.
  - Mike explains that there are several reasons for these low numbers. Firstly, the percentages are a result of the model run. We are able to increase the percentage of transit trips by including policy within the Plan for the land unit to require higher percentages. Secondly, this model run assumes only a portion of Tysons is built. So if we look further out, transit trips to and from Tysons is anticipated to increase. Thirdly, these percentages don't include internal trips, like employees or residents going to local retail and service uses within the study area.
- **Rock Hill Road Bridge** (no slide): WG member Greg Riegle asks what kind of statement the WG should make about the bridge. Should the bridge (or lack thereof) limit growth within the land unit?
  - Mike responds that we need more analysis, like that being done with the detailed grid analysis, to provide us with more details on how much the bridge is needed.

- **Reston Task Force Reception of Transportation Analysis** (no slide): John asks how the Reston TF received the transportation analysis the week before.
  - Mike responds that the Reston Study's transportation issues are more complex than Route 28's issues. Also, the Reston TF is more concerned about Toll Road crossings than our group is, since their area of study straddles the Toll Road and ours doesn't.

**Draft Plan Text:** Jeff leads the group in a discussion of the draft Plan text dated 03-29-13. See the following link for draft Plan text:

[http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/draft\\_plan\\_text\\_3\\_29\\_13.pdf](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/route28stationsouth/draft_plan_text_3_29_13.pdf)

The WG was able to discuss and agree upon language in the draft's transportation section, with the exceptions noted below.

#### **Discussion:**

- **Land Use/Transportation Balance** (p. 8): David Houston, speaking on behalf of Work Group member Bob Lawrence, comments on redundancy within the second paragraph.
  - Staff notes the redundancy and will remove it.
- **Road Network and Circulation** (p. 9): Concern was expressed about the Context Sensitive Solutions paragraph referencing a specific document.
  - Staff will remove any reference to the specific document.
- **Monitoring System** (p. 8): The suggestion was made that "existing traffic access points should be retained to the greatest extent possible."
- **Road Transportation Improvements** (p. 10): Greg expressed concern about the current reference to a street network map within the first paragraph on top of page ten.
  - Staff agrees and suggests a more general reference.
  - WG member Rae Noritake mentions that he'd like the street network map to either distinguish high priority streets vs low priority streets or to indicate the function of each link in the grid (i.e., for inter-parcel access or as a key vehicular access point for the entire land unit.)
    - Leonard Wolfenstein, FCDOT, says the grid analysis will help us address this concern.
    - John Ulfelder asks further whether this map, or something similar, should highlight links in the grid that are more critical than others.
    - Mike Garcia indicates that is possible and can be considered with results of the grid analysis.
  - John Ulfelder asks what the first bullet means, "Maximize continuity within the grid of streets."
    - Staff will make changes to the language to make the meaning of the paragraph clearer.
- **Public and Private Streets:** David Houston asks if it was intentional not to distinguish between public and private streets within the Road Network and Circulation section.
  - Staff indicates that this was intentional and done in order to provide flexibility in determining when private or public was appropriate.

- **Block Size** (p.10): Rae asks about the block size bullet. He wonders about the specific lengths.
  - Staff indicates we'll look into it further.
- **Cost-Benefit Analysis** (p.10): Mike Romeo and Rae would like to see urban design added as a criteria when evaluating potential road improvements.
  - Staff agrees to the addition.
- **New Streets Design Guidelines and VDOT** (p.10): Clara explains why staff proposes removing reference to VDOT policies.
  - Sterling adds that we want to avoid reference in the Plan to any specific outside entity's policies and regulations.
  - There is discussion about whether this guidance will relate to public or private streets.
  - Mike Garcia will work to address the issues raised by Clara and Sterling, along with its relation to public and private streets.
- **Flexibility for Street Design Guidance** (p.13): Greg Riegle expresses concern with the paragraph at the top of the page and whether it provides adequate flexibility for transitions between new and existing streets.
  - Staff will look into this. There may be further explanation within the Staff Report.
- **Transportation Demand Management** (p.13): There is a comment about needing to indicate that the TDM Goals table allowing for a gradual shift to more transit usage.
  - Staff offers adding language about "phasing to rail."
- **Parking Management** (p.14): Jeff expresses concern about the two comment boxes. These would seemingly require zoning changes.
  - FCDOT says they will work to address the desire for less parking in this area. This would make parking reductions under the current Zoning Ordinance easier, as well as allow the possibility for future Zoning Ordinance amendments to also allow less parking.

**Next Meeting Date:** 04-30-13 (Tuesday) @ 7:00 PM, location to be determined. A second WG meeting was set for 05-14-13 (Tuesday) @ 7:00 PM, location to be determined.